DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 443 CS 505 080

AUTHOR Craven, Marina; Thompson, Teresa
TITLE Contextual Determinants of Perceptions of Children's Communicator Style and Social Attractiveness.
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (35th, Honolulu, HI, May 23-27, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Research; *Interpersonal Attraction; *Interpersonal Communication; Nonverbal Communication; Primary Education; Social Behavior; Speech Communication; *Teacher Attitudes; *Young Children
IDENTIFIERS *Adult Child Relationship; *Communicator Style

ABSTRACT

A study examined whether the context in which interaction occurs would lead to any differences in adult perceptions of the relationship between children's communicator style and social attractiveness. Because previous research has indicated that teachers find children to be attractive when they communicate with friendly, relaxed, and attentive styles, it was hypothesized that nonteaching adults might find children to be attractive if they display slightly different communicator styles. Each of twenty children attending prekindergarten, kindergarten, or first grade in a private school (context 1) and a play school in the afternoon (context 2) was evaluated on ten dimensions of communicator style and three dimensions of attractiveness by two teachers and two play school supervisors. A cross-content comparison of the evaluations revealed a significant difference in only one area: adult perceptions of children's personal attractiveness. Teachers rated the children more highly on personal attractiveness than did the nonteaching adults. Further research is needed to examine the contextual determinants of children's communicator style and attractiveness. (Tables of findings are included.) (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CONTEXTUAL DETERMINANTS OF PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN'S COMMUNICATOR STYLE AND SOCIAL ATTRACTIVENESS

ED262443

Marina Craven
Department of Communication
University of Delaware
Newark, DE 19716

and

Teresa Thompson
Department of Communication
University of St. Thomas
Houston, TX 77006

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CS 505 080

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marina Craven

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether different interpersonal contexts would lead to any differences in adult perceptions of the relationship between children's communicator style and social attractiveness. Twenty children who attended a private school, P.K. through grade 1, in the morning (context 1) and a play school in the afternoon (context 2) were evaluated on 10 dimensions of communicator style and three dimensions of attractiveness by both teachers and play school supervisors. A cross-context comparison of the evaluations revealed a significant difference in only one area, teachers rated the children more highly on personal attractiveness than did the non-teaching adults.

CONTEXTUAL DETERMINANTS OF PERCEPTIONS OF CHILDREN S COMMUNICATOR STYLE AND SOCIAL ATTRACTIVENESS

The present study was undertaken to determine if the context in which interaction occurs would lead to any differences in adult perceptions of the relationship between children's communicator style and social attractiveness. The impact of context on adult perceptions of children was explored because previous research indicated that teachers found children to be attractive when they communicated with friendly, relaxed, and attentive styles (Stohl, 1981). It was hypothesized that *non-teaching* adults might find children to be attractive if they displayed slightly different communicator styles.

Within different contexts, we have impressions about the way people communicate. This is their style of communication, and on it our impressions are based. The way one communicates can be expected to affect how attractive that person appears to be (Norton & Pettegrew, 1977). Communicator style, as defined by Norton, is "the way an individual verbally and paraverbally interacts to signal how literal meaning should be taken, interpreted, filtered or understood" (1978, p. 99). It is measured on nine subconstructs: (1) impression leaving, (2) contentious, (3) open, (4) dramatic, (5) dominant, (6) relaxed, (7) friendly, (8) attentive, and (9) animated.

Although some of these nine subconstructs have been the focus of earlier studies of preschool children's behavior, most past research has been concerned only with communicator style and not with its relationship to social attractiveness. This may be a problem, because, although the previous research reveals how the children communicate, the results do not reveal *preferences* for communicator styles. For instance, Stott's factor analysis of childhood personality reveals that "a child who does not talk a great deal is not likely to talk with much

animation" (1962, p. 298). Kohn (1977) has explored the relationship between attentive, relaxed, dramatic and dominating symptoms and children's social competence. And Piaget (1926) has described children's open manner of communication. Ye none of these studies reveal perceptions of attractiveness for a given style.

The studies of children's social attractiveness, on the other hand, have largely ignored communicator style. They have concentrated on three areas: (1) physical appearance, (2) specific behaviors (such as sharing), and (3) *what* a child says rather than the *way* in which it is said.

Physical attractiveness has received the greatest attention. Most researchers conclude there is a strong link between physical attraction and social attractiveness (e.g., Langlois & Downs, 1979; Dion, Bersheid, & Walster, 1973; Kleck et al., 1974; Langlois & Stephen, 1977). Only Adams & Crane (1980) suggest that children may choose a playmate on the basis other than looks, although they fail to delineate other bases for the selection of a playmate.

Studies in the second area, specific behaviors related to social attractiveness, have been conducted by Yarrow and Waxler (1976) in both experimental and naturalistic settings. The authors examined three kinds of prosocial responses (sharing, helping and comforting) displayed by 108 children in an experimental setting and found that helping occurred more frequently than sharing or comforting. In the naturalistic setting, a nursery school playground, Yarrow and Waxler (1976) examined the prosocial and aggressive acts displayed by 77 of the 108 children in the first study. The authors reported that prosocial acts were expressed by 87% of the children while aggressive acts were exhibited by 93% of the children, thereby yielding a complex relationship between prosocial and aggressive behavior. Although the average

occurrence of physical aggression by boys was 5.1 as compared to the girls' score of 2.1, the authors found that neither age nor sex of the children was related to frequency of prosocial responding.

Research in the third area, the content of a child's communication, has focused only on the verbal level rather than the child's non-verbal communicator style, (e.g., Gottman, Gonzo, & Rasmussen, 1975; Oden & Asher, 1977; Lahavi & Asher, 1976). Gottman et al. (1975) found that popular children distribute and receive more positive verbal reinforcement than do unpopular children.

Despite differences in terminology, most attractiveness research concludes that social attractiveness remains relatively stable among preschool children. Adams and Cohen (1976) studied peer acceptance; Gottman (1977) examined popularity; Waldrop and Halverson (1975) looked at social ability; Hartup, Glazer, and Charlesworth 1967) focussed on sociometric status; Kleck, Richardson, and Ronald (1974) called it social acceptance.

Social attractiveness studies have also investigated teacher-student relationships (e.g., Adams and Cohen, 1976; Brophy & Good, 1974; Algozzine & Curan, 1979). These studies suggest that a child's lack of attractiveness to peers and/or teachers commonly results in poor performance and personal dissatisfaction.

There is some research which has been conducted linking both communicator style and social attractiveness. For the most part these studies have been concerned with adults, and have concentrated on just a few communicator style variables. Lowe and Goldstein (1970) and Mehrabian (1969), have researched the effects of expressive cues on attraction. Their findings

indicate that expressive cues can induce liking for a communicator. Simonson and Bahr (1974) have examined the effects of self-disclosure on the attractiveness of a therapist. They report that a therapist's attractiveness is not merely a function of content, but "involves the subject's knowledge of [and preference for] the therapist's style of interaction . . . ." (pp. 362-363).

Norton and Pettegrew (1977) were the first to examine a wide range of communicator styles and their relationship to attractiveness. This study of adults concluded that there is a strong link between the way an individual communicates and the perceptions of that individual's attractiveness. Friendly, attentive, and relaxed styles were the best predictors of attraction. However, open, dramatic, and animated styles were also somewhat related to attraction.

The results of the Norton and Pettegrew study received some support in Stohl's (1982) investigation of the relationship between children's communicator style and social attractiveness to peers and day-care teachers. The data indicate: (1) children who are attractive to their peers communicate in a more dramatic, open, impression-leaving, contentious, and animated manner, and (2) children who are attractive to teachers communicated in a more friendly, attentive, and relaxed style. Age also had an effect on communicator style, for five year olds exhibited a more relaxed, open, friendly, and attentive style than did three or four year olds.

It seems apparent that day-care teachers prefer young school children who are friendly, relaxed and attentive - the three same variables which Norton and Pettegrew found to be the best predictors of attraction among adults. However, dramatic, open, and animated styles were not associated with day-care teachers' attractiveness ratings of children. Here, the Stohl study differs from the findings of Norton and Pettegrew, for the latter research indicates that

dramatic, open, and animated communicator styles are also associated with attractiveness among adults.

This discrepancy could be attributed to contextual factors. The teacher's job of instructing is facilitated by a student who is relaxed, friendly and attentive. Stohl speculates that "perhaps in the classroom setting the dramatic and animated styles seem too aggressive ...." (1981, p. 373). The interactive effects of situation are supported in research by Rose, Bland, and Spatter (1975) and Bates (1976).

Rose et al. studied the behavior of preschool children in a variety of classroom contexts (e.g., alone, playing with other children) to investigate if the children displayed consistent behaviors within and across settings. The study concluded that, after four months of observation, children displayed stable behavior patterns within contexts; however, across contexts, the children's behavioral patterns showed variability even from day to day.

Bates examined the effects of one aspect of children's non-verbal behavior, facial expressions, upon adults. The 11-year old child confederates were instructed to display high or low amounts of facial expression, labeled in the study as non-verbal cues of positivity. The results of the study not only concluded that the higher level of positivity produced higher levels of adult non-verbal cues of positivity and more favorable written evaluations of the child's intellectual and social abilities than did the lower level of positivity, but that the sex of the adult subject, individual confederate differences, and a context variable all moderated the effects of the child's non-verbal cues of positivity. Bates surmised that "cues will have partially different effects when delivered by different children, to different kinds of adults, and in different situations" (1976, p. 1087).

The possibility that situational factors may influence adults' perceptions of the way a child communicates is suggested by Stohl (1982). She reports that the characteristics associated with young males include: noisiness, great activity, competitiveness, verbal and behavioral aggressiveness, interest in manipulation of objects, less eye contact and less sensitivity and/or awareness of non-verbal behavioral cues. The characteristics associated with young females include: quietness, accommodation, sedentariness, interest in verbal activities, greater eye contact and more communicative awareness. Stohl (1982) argues that teachers prefer that students, both males and females, exhibit female sex-typed behaviors (Brophy & Good, 1974; Fagot, 1981). However, Langlois and Downs (1980) have established that *parents* punish children for behaviors uncharacteristic of their sex and reward them for those behaviors which are characteristic of their sex. And Feinman's (1981) research confirms that "in contemporary American culture", cross-sex role behavior is less approved for boys than for girls. Stohl adds that Feinman needs to put in a qualifier "except in the case of teachers of contemporary American classrooms" (Stohl, 1982, p. 8).

Apparently, the academic setting imposes one set of guidelines for acceptable behavior of children, in that young boys and girls are praised for feminine-preferred activities, while the non-academic environment imposes a different set of behavioral guidelines, in that young boys and girls are punished for exhibiting behaviors uncharacteristic of their sex. From these conclusions it would seem appropriate to formulate the following research question:

Will academic and non-academic contexts lead to
any differences in the relationship between children's
communicator style and social attractiveness?

In order to approach the research question, this study has selected two distinctly different contexts—one academic, the other non-academic— in which adults were asked to assess

children's communicator style and attractiveness. The academic setting was a private school in a mid-Atlantic state which the twenty young children selected for this study attend from 8 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday. The pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, and first grade classrooms which the children in this study attend are relatively structured. The children are expected to attend to lessons in alphabet identification and language skills, numbers and simple arithmetic, music, art and nature studies. This structure is not quite as rigid for the pre-kindergarten group; however, their activities are more ordered than free play or recess. Although all the children have recess periods, it was their classroom behavior which the teachers were instructed to assess.

In contrast to the academic context, the non-academic context was a "play school," located just a few minutes away from the private school, which the twenty participating children attend during the afternoon. The emphasis in the play school is on play rather than school. There are no structured activities in this setting; instead, the children have the freedom to play as they will, although the three "play school" supervisors watch the children.

In order to explore the differences in these two types of contexts in relation to children's communicator style and attractiveness, this study examined how young children are perceived by teachers, compared to non-teaching adults outside the academic environment. Perceptions were based on the relationship between two factors: (1) the way a child communicates (i.e., friendly, contentious, relaxed, animated), and (2) the child's attractiveness (assessed on physical attraction, social attraction to other children, and personal attraction to teaching and non-teaching adults).

METHOD

Subjects: Twenty white children, from the pre-kindergarten (PK), kindergarten, and first grade of a private school in a mid-Atlantic state were selected for this study because they also attended a non-teaching play school nearby in the afternoon. There were seven females and 13 males. 10 children were in PK, five in kindergarten, and five in first grade.

There were six homeroom teachers (two for each grade) and three teaching assistants (one for each grade) in the school setting who evaluated the children on communicator style and attractiveness. With the exception of one white middle-age male teaching assistant, all other teachers and assistants were white middle-age females. In the play school setting, there were three supervisors, younger white females in their early thirties, who evaluated the children on style and attractiveness.

Procedure: In the school setting, each child was evaluated independently by handing out questionnaires to his/her homeroom teacher and the teaching assistant in the child's grade. This provided two evaluations for each child within the school setting.

Similarly, in the play school setting, each child received two evaluations. These were obtained by randomly assigning to the play school's three supervisors 13 questionnaires each (one received 14 questionnaires) to complete. By pairing the supervisors in three different combinations and randomly assigning each paired grouping questionnaires to complete, two separate supervisor ratings for each child were obtained.

Measures: The questionnaire was comprised of: (1) the long form of Norton's (1978), communicator style measure (CSM) which was modified in order to measure children's

communicator style, and (2) three assessments of the child's attractiveness (i.e., appearance, attractiveness to peers, and attractiveness to teaching/non-teaching adults). The forty-one statements on the CSM were measured on a seven-point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The three assessments of the child's attractiveness were also measured on a seven-point scale, however, the terms used in this rating were "very little" to "very much", in accord with Stohl's (1981) attractiveness measurement. Both the communicator style measure and the attractiveness rating have been used in previous studies, and therefore have been tested for reliability.

Units of Analysis: There were 41 questions on the questionnaire, four for each of Norton's nine style variables, and five measuring the child's overall communicator image (how well the child communicates). In addition, there were three attractiveness ratings measuring physical, peer, and personal attractiveness of the children. The four ratings for each style variable were averaged to give a single score for each of the nine style variables. The averaging procedure was used to yield a single score for communicator image.

The two academic context questionnaires for each child were averaged to yield single scores for every child on each of the 13 questionnaire items. Likewise, the two non-academic questionnaires for each child were averaged. This resulted in 13 ratings for each of the twenty children in the academic context and 13 ratings for every child in the non-academic context.

RESULTS

The results of a *t*-test for related measures indicated that, for the nine separate style scores and the communicator image assessment, there were no significant differences in the academic and non-academic ratings of children. However, within the non-academic context, the means were higher, the ranges were smaller, and the score averages were more clustered

than academic ratings for the following variables: dominance, dramatic, animated, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, open, friendly, and communicator image. On the remaining variable, a contentious style, the mean for the academic ratings was higher than the non-academic mean. Means, and standard deviations for communicator styles are presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

Comparisons of each context's three attractiveness ratings of children, however, revealed a significant difference in one of the attractiveness dimensions--teaching and non-teaching adults' personal attractiveness perceptions of children ($p < .007$). Teachers rated the children more highly on personal attractiveness than did the non-teaching adults. The mean for the academic rating of personal attractiveness was 5.80, whereas the mean for the non-academic rating was 4.70. Results of this *t*-test for related measures are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Results of a *t*-test for independent means investigating whether there were significant differences in style and attractiveness ratings based on genders of the children did not produce any significant differences in either of the two setting ratings of style and attractiveness.

A one-way analysis of variance, used to determine if age of the child would reveal a significant difference in ratings on communicator image, peer attractiveness and personal attractiveness to adults in either context, concluded that the age of the child produced no significant differences on any of these three variables.

The results of a Pearson correlation, investigating whether the attractiveness ratings which

children received in each setting were related to any particular style variables, did reveal some significant correlations; In the academic setting, the children's three attractiveness ratings were all significantly related only to a friendly style. The r values of a friendly style with each attractiveness dimension were: physical = .40, peer = .67, and personal = .40. In each instance $p < .05$. Results of the Pearson Correlation for the academic setting are presented in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 and Table 4 about here

In the non-academic setting, the children's three attractiveness ratings were significantly related to all of the following style variables: animated, impression leaving, relaxed, open, friendly, and children's communicator image. It was also discovered that dominant and attentive styles were correlated to peer attractiveness. Details of the Pearson Correlation for the non-academic setting are presented in Table 4.

The Pearson Correlation also revealed that all three attractiveness ratings within each setting were significantly related to each other. Teachers' physical, peer, and personal attractiveness ratings of children all displayed significant correlations, as did all the non-teaching adults' attractiveness ratings of children. Details of the Pearson Correlation for attractiveness are presented in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

DISCUSSION

The results of the *t*-test for related measures revealed a significant difference between settings for only one variable, adult perceptions of children's personal attractiveness. Due to

the number of tests computed to discover differences and examine relationships, it is possible that the significant difference between teachers' personal attractiveness ratings of children and the personal attractiveness ratings by non-teaching adults could be attributed to experiment-wise error. But because the mean difference between setting ratings for personal attractiveness was a full point above all other variable mean differences, another explanation seems more likely. Due to professional and ethical considerations, teachers may have been reticent to give any child a low personal attractiveness score. Out of a possible seven points for high personal attractiveness, the lowest score any teacher gave was a four. In contrast, withing the non-academic setting, the lowest score was a two. Teachers were not hesitant to give low scores of two or three when rating children on physical attractiveness or social attractiveness to other children; however, when teachers were asked to describe their personal liking for a child, it is conceivable that adults, in their role as teachers, believe that they should not dislike any child. Adults in the non-academic setting, not constricted by a teacher's role, may have felt freer to express their dislikes as well as their likes.

Because of the scoring of the communicator style measure, the higher means on style ratings reported for the non-academic setting indicate that non-teaching adults perceived children to be slightly less dominant, dramatic, animated, impression leaving, relaxed, attentive, open, friendly, and to have a slightly lower degree of communication ability (measured by communicator image) than did teachers rating children on these variables. And the lower means on attractiveness ratings reported for the non-academic setting reveal that non-teaching adults found children to be less attractive. Conversely, teachers perceived children to be more friendly, relaxed, open, etc., and rated the children as more attractive. A contentious style was the only exception to this pattern. Teachers rated children as being less contentious than the ratings given by non-teaching adults. This irregularity might be explained by the fact that a

contentious or argumentative style is not generally recognized a a positive attribute. It was the only style out of the nine which might be perceived in a negative manner. The teachers may have had reservations, for professional and ethical reasons, in giving ratings which would characterize a child as having a contentious style. Likewise, the academic setting may have imposed limitations contentiously behavior. In the less structured play school setting, children may have felt free to argue.

Excluding the contentiousness variable, a definite pattern was exhibited in a cross-setting comparison of children's style and attractiveness ratings. Teachers perceived the children to display more of each style variable and rated the children as being more physically, socially and personally attractive. The reverse was true for ratings in the non-academic setting. However, no conclusive differences between settings are indicated by this pattern.

An explanation for why the sex of the child did not reveal significant differences for either setting on ratings of style and attractiveness could be attributed to the very small sample size of children in this study. There were only seven females and 13 males. In contrast, the Stohl study (1982) which reported significant sex differences in teacher's perceptions of children's communicator style was based on a sample of 52 children with equal male/female cell sizes.

The small sample of the present study might also explain why the age of the child did not reveal a significant difference in either setting's ratings of style and attractiveness. As reported, there were 10 children in pre-kindergarten, five in kindergarten, and five in the first grade. The age groups may have been too few in number to detect any significant differences. In contrast, the Stohl (1981) study used no fewer than 16 children in each age group which

produced results "that older, preschool children and those who are perceived as more attractive by peers and teachers are reported by teachers to communicate in a different manner than those who are younger or less attractive" (p. 371).

When interpreting the results of the Pearson Correlation examining children's attractiveness and style relationships, it must be remembered that, within the academic setting, a significant correlation between children's style and attractiveness was exhibited only for the friendly style variable. Teachers perceived children to be more friendly and more attractive. This finding is in partial accord with the Stohl (1981) study, which found that children who are attractive to teachers communicate in more friendly, attentive, and relaxed styles. In the present study, children's attentive and relaxed styles were not significantly related to any of the teacher's attractiveness ratings of the children. However, the *r* values for these two variables in relation to attractiveness were higher (indicating a closer degree of correlation) than were the *r* values for the remaining six variables. Looking at Table 3, it can be noted that a contentious style did not exhibit the normal pattern of correlations. These *r* values were negative, though not significant.

Within the non-academic setting, the children's three attractiveness ratings were all correlated to animated, impression leaving, relaxed, open and friendly styles. The children's communicator image was also significantly correlated to all three attractiveness dimensions. Furthermore, dominant and attentive styles were significantly correlated to peer attractiveness. Here, the friendly, attentive, relaxed, open, animated, and dramatic styles which correlated with attractiveness were in accord with the style and attractiveness correlations reported in the Norton & Pettegrew study (1977). Once again, non-teaching adults perceived children to be less animated, relaxed, open, etc. and less attractive. From the results of the dominant and

attentive style correlations with peer attractiveness, it may be surmised that non-teaching adults who perceived children to be less dominant and attentive also perceive those children to be less attractive to their peers.

Overall, more style variables correlated with children's attractiveness measures within the non-academic setting. In the academic context, the children's communicator images were significantly related to all nine style variables; yet, in the non-academic setting, communicator image was significantly related to only six style variables. Dramatic, contentious, and animated styles were not related to communicator image in the non-academic ratings. Yet, an animated style and communicator image were both significantly related to all three attractiveness ratings within the non-academic setting.

Out of all the patterns revealed in this study, perhaps the most intriguing was the fact that teaching and non-teaching adults appeared to approach a similar situation from different perspectives. Teachers rated children more highly on attractiveness and more positively on communicator style, excluding the contentious variable. In contrast, non-teaching adults rated children lower on attractiveness and less positively on communicator style. Perhaps, operating in the role of a teacher, adults assume a more positive view of children. This finding suggests that further research is warranted on adults' perceptions of children in academic and non-academic settings.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study had many limitations. The number of subjects was small, and the cell sizes were unequal. Furthermore, it would be difficult to generalize the findings, in that children

and teachers were all white and did not differ greatly on socioeconomic status.

Reports of the children's style and attractiveness relied solely on adult perceptions. Therefore, it is difficult to state conclusively that children actually exhibited different communicator styles or whether adults just perceived that they did. Although the questionnaire defined a few examples of behaviors to measure each style, a detailed list of behaviors connected to each style cannot be derived from this study. A list of behaviors empirically linked with various styles could be pragmatically helpful if, for instance, a program was undertaken to train children to be more attentive or relaxed.

The attractiveness measures used in this study could not control for the children's physical attractiveness. As social attraction and appearance have been shown to be highly related (Adams & Crane, 1980), it is possible that the child's appearance may interact with those styles of communication which enhance his or her social standing. But an experimental manipulation of physical attraction would be necessary in future research to conclusively detect this hypothesized interaction. Another problem with the attractiveness measures is that bias could have been a factor on the adult ratings of children. Attractiveness is defined solely by the rater, as it is extremely difficult to standardize a definition of attractiveness. Future research should take this into account and perhaps devise a better method for rating attractiveness.

Yet another limitation of this study is the fact that all adult raters were female, with the exclusion of the one male assistant who only rated one child. Although females are most commonly the teachers for early years of schooling, it is probable that female and male adults would perceive the children differently. Future research may wish to examine if there are any differences in male and female adult perceptions of children's style and attractiveness.

Other suggestions for future research would include using a larger sample of children drawn from both public and private schools, insuring that age and sex cell sizes were about equal, selecting adult raters of mixed sex from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, and improving the attractiveness measurement to indicate a more precise definition of each attractiveness variable.

Despite the fact that this study's hypothesis was supported in only one area, the value of the present study seems to be in the detection of patterns in adults' cross-setting perceptions of children's style and attractiveness which warrant further investigation. If teachers perceive children differently than non-teaching adults, this may have a bearing on the children's behavior in each context. The more positive academic perceptions of children may influence those children to behave in a more positive manner. The reverse could be true for perceptions of children's behavior in a non-academic context. If this is true, future research might concentrate on methods of eliciting specific behaviors.

In conclusion, this study would urge that further research be conducted to examine the contextual determinants of adults' perceptions of children's communicator style and attractiveness. It is important that we identify the factors which impact the social and cognitive development of children. Then, understanding these factors may lead to more creative interaction from teaching and non-teaching adults to assist children in reaching their individual potentials regardless of personal attractiveness. Children's behaviors might improve, along with their abilities to communicate.

REFERENCES

Adams, G. R., & Crane, P. An assessment of parents' and teachers' expectations of preschool childrens' social preference for attractive children and adults. *Child Development*, 1980, *51*, 224-231.

Adams, G. R., & Cohen, A. S. Characteristics of children and people expectancy: An extension to the child's social and family life. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 1976, *70*, 87-91.

Algozzine, B., & Curan, T. J. Teachers' predictions of children's social success as a function of their behavioral tolerances. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 1979, *72*, 344-348.

Bates, J. E. Effects of children's nonverbal behavior upon adults. *Child Development*, 1976, *47*, 1079-1088.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1974.

Dion, K. K., Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1973, *44*, 562-568.

Gottman, J. M. Toward a definition of social isolation in children. *Child Development*, 1977, *48*, 513-517.

Gottman, J. M., Gonso, J., & Rasmussen, B. Social interaction, social competence and friendship in children. *Child Development*, 1975, *46*, 709-718.

Hartup, W. W., Glazer, J. A., & Charlesworth, R. Peer reinforcement and sociometric status. *Child Development*, 1974, *45*, 305-310.

Hays, D. S. Cognitive bases for liking and disliking among preschool children. *Child Development*, 1978, *49*, 906-909.

Kleck, R. E., Richardson, S. A., & Ronald, L. Physical appearance cues and interpersonal attraction in children. *Child Development*, 1974, *45*, 305-310.

Kohn, M. *Social competence, symptoms and underachievement in childhood: A longitudinal perspective*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977, p. 40-49.

Langlois, J. H. & Down, A. C. Peer relations as a function of physical attractiveness: The eye of the beholder or behavioral reality? *Child Development*, 1979, *50*, 409-418.

Langlois, J., & Stephen, C. The effects of physical attractiveness and ethnicity on children's behavioral attributions and peer preferences. *Child Development*, 1977, *48*, 1694-1698.

Lowe, C. A., & Goldstein, J. W. Reciprocal liking and attributions of ability: Mediating effects of perceived intent and personal involvement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1970, *16*, 291-297.

Mehrabian, A. Significance of posture and position in the communication of attitude and status relationships. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1969, *71*, 359-372.

Norton, R. W. Foundation of a communicator style construct. *Human Communication Research*, 1978, *4*, 99-112.

Norton, R. W., & Pettegrew, L. S. Communicator style as an effect determinant of attraction. *Communication Research*, 1977, *4*, 257-282.

Piaget, J. *The language of thought of the child*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1926.

Rose, S. A., Blank, M., & Spatter, I. Situational specificity of behavior in young children. *Child Development*, 1975, *46*, 464-469.

Simonson, N. R., & Bahr, S. Self-disclosure by the professional and paraprofessional therapist. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1974, *42*, 359-363.

Stohl, C. Perceptions of social attractiveness and communicator style: A developmental study of preschool children. *Communication Education*, 1981, *30*, 367-376.

Stohl, C. Sugar or spice: Teachers' perceptions of sex differences in communicative correlates of a transaction. *Communication Yearbook VI*, Rutgers N.J.: Transaction Books, 1982.

Stott, L. H. Personality at age four. *Child Development*, 1975, *46*, 19-26.

Yarrow, M. & Waxler, C. Dimensions and correlates of prosocial behavior in young children. *Child Development*, 1976, *47*, 118-135.

TABLE 1.
COMMUNICATOR STYLE COMPARISONS

Variable:	PDQ	and	SDO	PDR	and	SDR
Mean:	4.214		3.702	4.270		4.178
S.D.:	1.370		1.820	0.921		1.756
Variable:	PAN	and	SAN	PIM	and	SIM
Mean"	4.259		3.984	3.821		3.360
S.D.:	0.937		1.631	1.129		1.409
Variable:	PRX	and	SRX	PAT	and	SAT
Mean:	3.552		3.359	3.793		3.325
S.D.:	0.726		1.166	1.149		1.163
Variable:	POP	and	SOP	PFR	and	SFR
Mean:	4.039		3.515	3.884		3.521
S.D.:	0.872		1.652	0.948		1.280
Variable:	PCO	and	SCO	PCI	and	SCI
Mean:	4.433		4.502	3.871		3.565
S.D.:	1.048		1.798	1.078		1.442

AT = Attentive
OP = Open
FR = Friendly
CO = Contentious
TC = Overall style
CI = Communicator image

P = Play school setting
S = School setting
DO = Dominance
DR = Dramatic
AN = Animated
IM = Impression leaving
RX = Relaxed

TABLE 2.
T - TEST FOR RELATED MEASURES
ADULT PERSONAL ATTRACTIVENESS PERCEPTIONS

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Mean Difference
PZA	4.700	1.551	0.347	-1.100
SZA	5.800	0.818	0.183	

Variable	T Value	Degrees of Freedom	2 - Tail Probability
PZA SZA	-3.01	19	0.007

TABLE 3.
PEARSON CORRELATION: ACADEMIC SETTING ATTRACTIVENESS AND COMMUNICATOR STYLE

STYLE	SXA with	SYA with	SZA with
Dominant	r = .1059	.1722	.0888
Dramatic	r = .0763	.1167	.0026
Contentious	r = -.2412	-.3422	-.2145
Animated	r = .0219	.0768	.0497
Impression leaving	r = .3483	.2351	.1378
Relaxed	r = .2435	.3691	.2935
Attentive	r = .1578	.1627	.2206
Open	r = .0162	.0189	.0198
Friendly	r = .3953*	.6724*	.4776*
Communicator image	r = .3032	.3499	.2811

* = $p<.05$

XA = Physical attractiveness

YA = Peer

ZA = Personal attractiveness to adult raters

Scores on the communicator style measure have been reflected to facilitate ease in interpretation of the correlations.

TABLE 4.
PEARSON CORRELATION NON-ACADEMIC SETTING ATTRACTIVENESS AND COMMUNICATOR STYLE

Style	PXA with	PYA with	PZA with
STYLE	SXA with	SYA with	SZA with
Dominant	r = .2619	.4379•	.1116
Dramatic	r = .0644	.0131	.1377
Contentious	r = .0957	.0477	.1028
Animated	r = .4847•	.4742•	.4747•
Impression leaving	r = .5812•	.5558•	.4814•
Relaxed	r = .4344•	.5520•	.3747•
Attentive	r = .3548	.4085•	.3536
Open	r = .5056•	.6166•	.4627•
Friendly	r = .5077•	.6685•	.5006•
Communicator image	r = .4885•	.6132•	.4085•

• = $p<.05$

XA = Physical attractiveness

YA = Peer

ZA = Personal attractiveness to adult raters

Scores on the communicator style measure have been reflected to facilitate ease if interpretation of the correlations.

TABLE 5
PEARSON CORRELATION FOR ATTRACTIVENESS

	PXA	PYA	PZA
PXA		r = 0.6334	r = 0.7703
PYA			r = 0.7230
PZA			

	SXA	SYA	SZA
SXA		r = 0.5959	r = 0.3824
SYA			r = 0.6424
SZA			

• = p<.05
P = Play school
S = School
XA = Physical attractiveness
YA = Peer attractiveness
ZA = Personal attractiveness to adult rater